

~~SECRET~~

20 FEB 1969

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Support

THROUGH

:

SUBJECT

: Review of Records Management Board Questions

As you requested at our meeting Wednesday, 12 February, the following issues and policy questions facing the Records Management Board are elaborated below:

1. Use of GSA Facilities
2. Vital Records Program Changes
3. Archives Policy and Location
4. Central vs Decentral Records Program
5. Central Control of Microfilming Developments
6. Review of Indefinite Disposal Instructions
7. Responsibilities of the Board

1. The Board will need policy guidance on these two questions concerning Agency use of the GSA Federal Records Centers:

- a. The GSA, National Archives and Records Services, offer to store any inactive records turned over to their custody. They have security cleared personnel and secure vault storage facilities. These are available without cost or personnel positions and are

~~SECRET~~

GROUP 1  
Excluded from automatic  
downgrading and  
declassification

**SECRET**

used by A.E.C., State Department, D.I.A., and the military organizations to store their classified material. Access to the records is restricted to the depositing Agency. There has been no specific policy stated concerning the use of GSA Records Centers for the storage of selected Agency files. Agency microfilming and storage construction costs run from \$20 to \$80 per cubic foot. The possible use of the GSA facilities for several thousand boxes of selected Agency records could preclude a proportionate filming or renovation expenditure. But, Security, publicity, and CI considerations may outweigh the economics. The Board will appreciate your comment before it studies further the use of GSA Records Centers as a possible alternative in the Agency records storage problem.

b. In 1967 GSA authorized the Agency to use temporarily until December 1970, some 25,000 cubic feet of compartmented vault space in its Records Center at Suitland, Maryland. They do not want a separate CIA operation inside their facility. Also, they will accept custody of records but do not consider these extra copies of Agency publications to be a record. The Agency does not want the custody of these particular reports turned over to GSA. Use of this space is an annual savings to the Agency. Current studies by Office of Logistics find that to secure the Warehouse Annex at  the renovations will cost in excess of \$300,000. The savings at Suitland seem sufficient to warrant serious re-negotiations with GSA to extend the present storage arrangements. The

**SECRET**

SECRET

Board is uncertain whether or not the Agency would prefer to terminate the arrangement as early as possible or when scheduled in December 1970. Informal relations with National Archives officials seem to indicate that at least a temporary extension of some months may be possible. This could change because Suitland is filling up much faster than they anticipated. Before we begin any serious effort for any extension whatsoever we await your comment.

2. These three recent developments impact on some 9,000 cubic feet of Vital Records now in the Records Center and deserve attention:

a. At present most of NPIC is not part of the Agency Emergency Plan. Only their Imagery Analysis Branch is in the plan. The rest may or may not go to Air Force in an emergency. The Director, NPIC/DDI should be asked to review his plans for emergency relocation and then store his 3,000 cubic feet of emergency Vital Records and the necessary photo interpretation equipment accordingly. A survey of this problem was completed by the NPIC Records Manager over two months ago. Last week the Board asked the DDI Senior Records Officer to seek an answer.

b. The Agency Emergency Relocation Plan should be re-examined and up-dated. This time, related Vital Records Plans should be studied simultaneously. Similarly related emergency equipment requirements for automation, map production, or other specialized Agency products

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

should be reviewed by the Emergency Officer and his Planning Committee.

c. Independent of the above reviews, the Vital Records now stored and those scheduled for storage should be more seriously examined by the responsible Offices to insure the inclusion of only essential material for emergency operations. A legitimate part of this Program is the scheduled deposit and regular removal of back-up tapes and files stored as precautions against procedural accidents in the offices. But, we find some components have labeled deposits Vital because they could not otherwise be justified for storage in the Center. Although the Purge includes some review of the Vital Records deposits, a word from you or Col. White will tighten the scrutiny.

3. In 1959 the Director ordered that all predecessor Agency records be removed from the National Archives. Today, the Agency Archives at the Center total some 6,000 cubic feet of documents of permanent value which pose these questions:

a. No specific recognition has been made of the Agency Archival function. The existing regulation  has been broadly interpreted to enable the Records Center facilities to be used for this operation to permanently preserve the records required by law.  has reviewed this collection and endorses it. Part-time manpower is provided from other Records Center operations because this

25X1

25X1

~~SECRET~~

**SECRET**

function must eventually exist and the missing documents must be found now while there is still hope of their being salvaged.

The material is organized, indexed, and finding aids developed for this collection. But, the Agency Archives are far from complete. Elsewhere in the Center among the inactive records are some 15,000 feet of files from the Directors, Deputies, and Office Heads and scheduled for "permanent" retention. Eventually all these must be refined and probably less than half moved into the Archives collection and the remaining duplicates or marginal files rescheduled for disposal. Preliminary estimates show that a total of 30,000 cubic feet of records could be removed from the Center (6,000 Archives, 15,000 Permanent, and 9,000 OSS and others) if the Archival function was more specifically established, manned, and relocated.

b. The possibility of this Archives activity being set up in the   Warehouse Annex or at   is worth consideration. The limited periodic transfer of Archive materials better tolerates these distances than do the Supplemental Distribution or the inactive office files each with some 250 reference services per day. Also travel and board accommodations for transient researchers are equally good at   and these two sites. But, the Archives are permanent records and require quality storage and humidity control if they are to be fit for use in the distant future. Further, the Archives are for historians who require more

25X1

25X1

25X1

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

25X1

facilities than do a few clerks servicing requests and shipping material back to the Offices for use. Consequently, the recently estimated costs at [ ] to repair the floor, shore up the roof, install lights, water, heat, and secure the building are \$300,000 for Supplemental Distribution operations and \$560,000 when humidity controls and research offices are added for an Archives. Similarly, the personnel requirements increase. Four Clerks (GS-7 and 9) would be needed to service 20,000 feet of publications there. The Archives would eventually require two officers from each Directorate to screen their records into the permanent collection. In charge would be the Agency Archivist and an aide with a clerical support. (The 30,000 feet of Archives would need from 7 to 12 professionals and 1 to 3 clericals). The Archives is an inevitable part of the Agency because we can't use National Archives. The foregoing is a modest, rough estimate. The question is not "Will you?" but rather "When?" If the Board can have an expression on the Archives, it can better predict the Purge results, begin studies to arrange for the disposition of large volumes, prepare for use of existing facilities and calculate the manpower and funds required to cope with the Agency's many storage problems.

4. The problem facing every Agency Program that crosses jurisdictional lines also burdens the total Records Program. The problem of centralized versus decentralized administration requires consideration:

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

a. The Records Program Regulation ( ) sets forth a total program covering Records Creation, File Maintenance, and Records Disposition as prescribed by the Federal Records Act of 1950 (PL --81-754). That Regulation states that the CIA Records Administration Officer shall "review and approve records control schedules, vital records schedules, and requests for equipment and supplies" ( ) and "approve new or revised forms" (b). Such authority for approval includes authority of disapproval and control over any records creation (forms) maintenance systems (equipment and supplies) and disposition (schedules). The implementation of the established Records Program is decentralized in paragraph d(2). With the reduction of the central staff from in 1961 they could barely do more than centrally review and approve requests with only occasional surveys and instructional activity. Consequently, that decentralized activity naturally became more and more independent of central supervision. New improvisations often went undetected until they developed problems for the creator or others not consulted but seriously impinged upon.

b. Recent discussions with the General Council representative to the Board seem to indicate he interprets as we do, that the Federal Law, the Regulation, and designation of the CIA Records Administration Officer are the top authority for Agency records management.

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

Earlier he had expressed a view that the Directorates were independent of any central control. I believe any pronouncement from you or Col. White for records action will be implemented without question to the extent management provides necessary manpower, funds, and time. Any intention to reverse the decentral domination of the past several years can best be achieved by calling attention to the need for a more active Records Program in every component and the requirement that the central staff review those efforts each year and report its findings to you and the Directorate Records Management Officer concerned. He should respond to the CIA Records Administration Officer concerning the corrective action he has taken or improvements made. Any differences of opinion would be passed up to the Offices of the Deputy Directors concerned for resolution. Also, the Directorate Quarterly Purge reports to the Board could contain more about the progress of the Records Program.

5. All Directorates are diligently studying microfilming applications. Good management and security principles require review of that activity:

a. The Board members are quite vocal in their belief that the Directorates should not be inhibited in free access to all vendors and determination of their own needs and development of miniaturized records storage and retrieval systems. The Agency's experience with computer development graphically illustrates the advantages

**SECRET**



**SECRET**

and disadvantages of such uncontrolled rugged individualism. The use of miniaturized record systems will accelerate enormously in the next two years. Drastic changes some 5 years hence with newer expensive techniques will cause today's efforts to be revised and probably redone. But, on the other side, today's filming efforts will develop a competence among the personnel and new office procedures to fit the new medium; all of which will be future assets.

b. The microfilming responsibility is fragmented across the Agency and no management or coordination requirement is specified. My central staff has broadly interpreted the Records Program to encompass any miniaturized medium or system. The Printing Services Division, DDS, is responsible for filming upon request; the Office of Computer Services, DDS&T, provides assistance on equipment questions; and the Office of Research and Development, DDS&T is reviewing current developments in the field as is my staff. CRS/DDI and RID/DDP have large independent filming operations. There now are some 90,000 reels of film stored in the Records Center. Neither my staff nor the Board has any manpower or filming expertise available today to attempt any control of microfilm applications or development. The problem is long-range but urgent and impacts Agencywide. The systems adopted cross all Directorates and will compel costly procedural and equipment changes among all users. At the very least there is need for

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

an ad hoc committee to conduct a formal study of the coming microminiaturization world, to recommend the Agency's approach to the field, and to ascertain the advisability of central control in our unique environment.

6. With regard to the Purge there are 38,000 cubic feet of "Indefinite" records on deposit with no definite disposal date scheduled. But, those records all have a "Review Date." This distinction has serious ramifications that warrant official attention:

a. The Records Center classifies records without any disposal date as indefinite because they find the majority of "Review Dates" merely result in a new date for another review in the future. Records Center experience shows that on most "Review Date" anniversaries someone in the Office reads a copy of the deposit receipt form, exclaims, "These files were before my time and I know nothing about them or what to do with them." Then he requests moving the date up for another review cycle. Thus the deposits remain and they are further than ever from any final decision. Future officers will know even less about those records.

b. All current Purge Officers should be notified that at the next "Review Date" the records must be thoroughly reviewed and a decision made to give every "Indefinite" deposit a specific disposal date. We are not asking that the records be destroyed now, only that a decision be made now. Any deposit seriously in need of close review

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

by the depositing Office prior to the destruction operation can be recalled just before the disposal date. The prospect and experience of hundreds of boxes arriving in the offices will quickly develop a management skill for decision making with regard to scheduling records disposition.

7. On 11 July 1968 Col. White asked the Deputies to appoint officers they trust to get rid of at least half the Directorate's holdings at the Records Center. The Board was created to monitor that "Records Purge" and study records problems and recommend solutions. To tighten the meaning of management's intent and to determine whether the Board has properly interpreted its responsibilities some clarifications are necessary:

a. On 1 July 1968 the Agency Records Center--with a total capacity of 106,800 cubic feet--contained 104,373 cubic feet of records. By year's end the Board's efforts had removed 6,779 cubic feet of those July records. Another thousand feet were authorized for permanent removal. But, in the meantime 6,310 feet of new accessions reduced the Board's success to a net gain of only 469 cubic feet of useable storage space. Likewise, the Board finds that thorough reviews average three man-hours per box. Consequently, some offices are omitting certain types of records from review and others are decided upon by an analysis of the deposit receipts. The time-frame for the "Purge" was not specified and the last concentrated effort to purge the Center took five years (1963 thru 1967) and resulted

**SECRET**

**SECRET**

in disposal of 55,000 cubic feet. Unfortunately, during that period 76,000 cubic feet of new deposits were received (21,000 more than were removed.) Consequently, the Board is aiming for a target of 52,000 cubic feet of records permanently removed from the Center. Further, they recognize the need for additional efforts in other areas to reduce deposits.

b. Finally, after thousands of boxes have been removed, reviewed, and destroyed and still other thousands of reviewed boxes are returned to the shelves the Board members are increasingly uncertain of reaching the goal of 50%. At present they speak of it being difficult to achieve 25% destruction and 5% transferred out of the Agency. They have not had sufficient experience with the Purge as yet to be willing to make a firm prediction, but they do hope to include such a projection in their next quarterly report. The Board feels the Purge is an interim measure to gain time to institute other, more-lasting corrective measures to improve our storage capabilities and are now endeavoring to identify the various alternatives available to the Agency. Your comments as to priorities, time frame, and statistical emphasis will benefit the Board considerably.

25X1

Chairman  
Records Management Board

25X1

DDP/SSS/RAB/[ ]:fms (20 Feb 69)

**SECRET**